

REMARKS

Claims 25-39 are pending in the present application. No claims are currently amended. The rejections of claims 25-39 are respectfully traversed. In view of the remarks as forth below, reconsideration is respectfully requested. No new matter has been entered as a result of this response.

I. - Rejection of Claims 25-33, 36 and 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103:

Claims 25-33, 36 and 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Pollalis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,016,170, "Pollalis") in view of Gatto (U.S. Patent No. 7,167,838. "Gatto"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant respectfully submits that Pollalis discloses a task management system which allows a user to use a layout on a graphical interface to visualise the progress of a series of projects over a timeline (See Figures 4 and 23). In addition, the system taught by Pollalis also includes disclosure of functionality whereby a user can monitor the different types of resource or tasks for the particular type of project whilst allowing the adjustment of a timeline of a project in accordance with the changes to the resources used by the project (See Figure 11 and its supporting text).

The Examiner asserted that Pollalis discloses "a project planned line for each of said at least one project juxtaposed with said graphic, said project planned line including a period to date actual bar graph having a length indicating a time to which said project actual amount is planned relative to said graphic (Pollalis: Fig. 4 - labels 72-76). (Office Action p. 3).

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's contention that Pollalis discloses the feature of "*a project planned line for each of said at least one project juxtaposed with said report period graphic, said project planned line including a period to date actual bar graph having a length indicating a time to which said project actual amount is planned relative to said report period graphic,*" as recited in Applicant's independent claims 25 and 39.

Although the Examiner specifically refers to Figure 4 of Pollalis, the referred diagram does not disclose the feature of “a period to date actual bar graph having a length indicating time to which said project actual amount is planned relative to said report period graphic.” Rather, the bar graphs in Figure 4 of Pollalis illustrates a time block of a specific task in use for a specific project only. In another words, the bar graph of Figure 4 only illustrates the time in which the task of the project is undertaken but does not visually represent any accumulation of resources other than the engagement of the resource for a specific period of time. As such, the bar graphs of Pollalis do not visually represent any “period to date” aspect of any resource of an individual project, and therefore, could not be considered to disclose or suggest the feature of a period to date actual bar graph, as recited in Applicants’ independent claims 25 and 39.

In addition to the above deficiency, Pollalis does not discloses any presentation means of “presenting a graphical representation of said data, said graphical representation of data including:

a report period graphical representing a report period timeline;

a period to date planned line alignable with a selected time on said report period graphic,” as recited in Applicant’s independent claims 25 and 39.

In this regard, Applicant’s respectfully submit that Gatto, cited in combination with Pollalis, does not disclose these features. As such it cannot be considered reasonable to reject independent claims 25 and 39 based on a combination of Pollalis and Gatto since a combination of the two documents still does not disclose or suggest the feature of the claims.

Applicant’s respectfully submit that Gatto discloses a system arranged to conduct stock analysis and is capable of displaying earnings or other monetary data based on analysis of historical results. Although Gatto discloses the presentation of a chart (Col 11 lines 35 to 51) which shows the earnings of a particular stock over a particular time period, it does not show any “period to date planned line alignable with a selected time on said report period graphic.”

This is consistent with the systems disclosed by Gatto since the disclosure of a period to date planned line alignable with a selected time period has little relevance to the stock analysis. This is because a “period to date feature” conveys little value to the field of securities analysis as

“*period to date*” fields do not measure any useful data in the context of Gatto. It follows that it would not have been obvious for a Skilled Person in the Art to have combined Gatto with Pollalis since the two patent documents clearly teaches technology in two separate areas. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the present rejection.

The Examiner also rejected claim 33 contending that Pollalis teaches the feature of a “*variance indicator bar graph scaled relative to variance between said project actual amount and said a project planned amount.*” In this regard, the Examiner specifically refers to Col 9, Lines 29-33 and Figure 23 of Pollalis. However, there is no such disclosure in Pollalis or Gatto and a review of the referenced portions of Pollalis does not disclose any such feature. In light of the deficiencies of the prior art, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 25-33, 36 and 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

II. - Rejection of Claims 34, 35, 37 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103:

Claims 34, 35, 37 and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Pollalis in view of Gatto and further in view of various combinations of Johnston et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,404,444, “Johnston”), Powell (U.S. Patent No. 5,291,397, “Powell”), Trcka et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,453,345, “Trcka”), and Chrisman et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0069782, “Chrisman”). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

As described above Pollalis and/or Gatto alone or in combination do not disclose or suggest each and every limitation as recited in Applicant’s independent claims 25 and 39, and by extension all other rejected claims which are dependent thereupon.

Applicant respectfully submits that none of Johnston, Powell, and/or Chrisman cure the deficiencies of Pollalis and/or Gatto. Thus, claims 34, 35, 37 and 38 are believed allowable for reasons related to their own recitations, in addition to the reasons noted above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections of claims 34, 35, 37 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 are improper and should be withdrawn. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

If any points remain an issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below. The Examiner is invited and encouraged to telephone the undersigned with any concerns in furtherance of the prosecution of the present application.

Please charge any deficiency as well as any other fee(s) which may become due at any time during the pendency of this application, or credit any overpayment of such fee(s) to Deposit Account No. 50-2896.

Respectfully submitted,

January 19, 2011
Dated:

/s/JPQ/
Joseph P. Quinn (Reg. No. 45,029)
Customer No. 71130
Attorney for Applicant(s)
SEYFARTH SHAW LLP
World Trade Center East
Two Seaport Lane, Suite 300
Boston, MA 02210
Tel: 617-946-4833
Fax: 617 946-4801
E-mail: bosippto@seyfarth.com